

The University of Southern Mississippi

## The Aquila Digital Community

---

### Dissertations

---

Summer 8-2016

# The Influence of Informant and Measurement on the Relations Among Adolescent Narcissism, Prosocial Behavior, and Emotional and Social Intelligence

Rebecca Lynn Kauten

*University of Southern Mississippi*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Clinical Psychology Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Kauten, Rebecca Lynn, "The Influence of Informant and Measurement on the Relations Among Adolescent Narcissism, Prosocial Behavior, and Emotional and Social Intelligence" (2016). *Dissertations*. 120.

<https://aquila.usm.edu/dissertations/120>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact [Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu](mailto:Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu).

The University of Southern Mississippi

THE INFLUENCE OF INFORMANT AND MEASUREMENT ON THE RELATIONS  
AMONG ADOLESCENT NARCISSISM, PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR, AND  
EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE

by

Rebecca Lynn Kauten

Abstract of a Dissertation  
Submitted to the Graduate School  
Of The University of Southern Mississippi  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

August 2016

## ABSTRACT

# THE INFLUENCE OF INFORMANT AND MEASUREMENT ON THE RELATIONS AMONG ADOLESCENT NARCISSISM, PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR, AND EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE

by Rebecca Lynn Kauten

August 2016

Adolescent narcissism has been extensively linked with aggression, but its relation with more positive behavioral correlates has been largely overlooked in the literature. Some research has investigated the divergent adaptive and maladaptive personality and behavioral correlates of non-pathological and pathological (i.e., grandiose, vulnerable) narcissism (Barry & Kauten, 2014; Barry & Wallace, 2010). This study sought to replicate previous findings that pathological narcissism is linked to self-reported prosocial behavior (Kauten & Barry, 2014) and further investigated the relation of self-reported narcissism with self-, parent-, and peer-reported prosocial behavior in a sample of 212 adolescents ( $M$  age = 16.8 years,  $SD$  = .77; 175 males, 34 females, 3 missing gender data). The present study also sought to examine the potential moderating effect of emotional and social intelligence on the relations between narcissism and prosocial behavior. Social intelligence moderated the relation between grandiose narcissism and self-reported ideal volunteer hours, and several interesting correlations were evident among the various dimensions of narcissism and informant ratings of prosocial behavior. For example, non-pathological narcissism demonstrated a positive relation with parent-reported prosocial behavior, and vulnerable narcissism showed a positive relation with self-reported prosocial behavior and an inverse relation with peer-

reported prosocial behavior. Grandiose narcissism was positively related to both self- and parent-reported prosocial behavior. The implications of the findings are discussed.

COPYRIGHT BY  
REBECCA LYNN KAUTEN  
2016

The University of Southern Mississippi

THE INFLUENCE OF INFORMANT AND MEASUREMENT ON THE RELATIONS  
AMONG ADOLESCENT NARCISSISM, PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR, AND  
EMOTIONAL AND SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE

by

Rebecca Lynn Kauten

A Dissertation  
Submitted to the Graduate School  
and the Department of Psychology  
of The University of Southern Mississippi  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Approved:

---

Dr. Christopher Barry, Committee Chair  
Associate Professor, Psychology

---

Dr. Bradley Green, Committee Member  
Associate Professor, Psychology

---

Dr. Randolph Arnau, Committee Member  
Associate Professor, Psychology

---

Dr. Donald Sacco, Committee Member  
Assistant Professor, Psychology

---

Dr. Karen S. Coats  
Dean of the Graduate School

August 2016

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my dissertation chair and major professor, Dr. Christopher Barry who has pushed me to reach my full potential, both in this project and throughout my graduate career, and without whom this project would not have been possible. Though the process has been difficult at times, his encouragement and expertise have afforded me several opportunities and have helped me to achieve more than I ever expected. Special thanks are also owed to Dr. Bradley Green, Dr. Randolph Arnau, and Dr. Donald Sacco for their time, suggestions, and encouragement throughout this project. In particular, their suggestions and expertise helped to develop the methodology for this project.

Lastly, I am appreciative of the students in the Youth Personality and Behavior Lab at The University of Southern Mississippi for their assistance in data collection, and for the individuals at the Camp Shelby Youth Challenge Program in Hattiesburg, MS, for their cooperation and assistance with this project.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT .....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	iv
LIST OF TABLES .....	vii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS.....	viii
CHAPTER	
I.    INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.   NARCISSISM.....	3
III.  AGGRESSION AND PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR.....	7
IV.   EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE.....	10
V.    SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE.....	13
VI.   MEASUREMENT OF PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND MULTI- INFORMANT PERSPECTIVES .....	15
VII.  PRESENT STUDY .....	18
Hypotheses	
VIII. METHOD.....	21
Participants	
Measures	
Procedure	
IX.   RESULTS .....	31
Preliminary Analyses	
Correlational Analyses	
Regression Analyses	
Additional Analyses	



X.	DISCUSSION .....	44
	Limitations	
	Future Directions	
	APPENDIX.....	55
	REFERENCES .....	56

## LIST OF TABLES

### Table

1.	Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables .....	32
2.	Correlations among Inflation Scores and Study Variables .....	34
3.	Correlations among Prosocial Behavior Variables and Gender, Ethnicity, and Social Desirability.....	35
4.	Correlations among Study Variables .....	36
5.	Relations among Prosocial Behavior and Elements of Pathological Narcissism.....	41
6.	Correlations among Various Forms of Narcissism and Elements of Social Intelligence.....	42

## LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

### Figure

1. Interaction between grandiose narcissism and social intelligence to predict self-reported ideal volunteer hours (with outlier excluded).....40

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

The growing empirical interest in adolescent narcissism has elucidated its relations with a number of behavioral and personality constructs. Perhaps the most robust and uniform finding across conceptualizations of narcissism is its positive relation with aggression (e.g., Barry & Kauten, 2014; Barry & Wallace, 2010; Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Pincus et al., 2009). More recently, some dimensions of narcissism have demonstrated associations with attributes that are generally considered positive (e.g., prosocial behavior, empathy; Barry, Kauten, & Lui, 2014; Kauten & Barry, 2014). The investigation of moderating variables in these associations is important for determining factors that might strengthen narcissism's connection to desirable behaviors and mitigate its association with antisocial behaviors such as aggression.

Although the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior has been evident only for self-reports (Kauten & Barry, 2014), the finding suggests that in some way, individuals with narcissistic traits perceive themselves as behaving positively toward others. The current study sought to explore potential moderating factors in the recently described relation between adolescent narcissism and prosocial behavior. By investigating certain intrapersonal variables (e.g., emotional intelligence, social intelligence), the conditions under which self-reported prosocial behavior is evident were considered. Additionally, identification of these factors early in development may provide insight regarding means of promoting prosocial behavior while also minimizing aggression. Furthermore, this study contributes to the existing literature through an examination of the relations of narcissism with various measures (e.g., self-report, other-

report, intent to engage in volunteer behavior) of prosocial behavior, thus providing insight as to whether the existing correlation truly exists or is if it is influenced by impression management and desirable responding.

## CHAPTER II

### NARCISSISM

Narcissism is a collection of personality traits that is expressed through an arrogant and superior interpersonal presentation. Individuals with narcissistic traits typically maintain a grandiose attitude with an air of self-confidence (Barry, Frick, & Killian, 2003; Hill & Lapsley, 2011). However, narcissism has been conceptualized as having different manifestations reflected by different measurement instruments, with each form associated with varying levels of maladjustment by virtue of their behavioral and emotional correlates (Barry & Kauten, 2014). So-called non-pathological narcissism has been perceived as less problematic and potentially more socially and personally advantageous than grandiose or vulnerable elements of pathological narcissism. Specifically, despite its consistent correlation with delinquency and both proactive and reactive aggression, non-pathological narcissism has demonstrated a positive correlation with self-esteem (Barry & Wallace, 2010) and has shown negative relations with anxiety, depression, and social stress (Barry & Kauten, 2014). Additionally, this conceptualization of narcissism has been related to both feelings of self-reliance and positive perceptions of one's relationships with others (Barry & Kauten, 2014). Therefore, non-pathological narcissism includes the positive and robust sense of self that is typical of classic views of narcissism.

Pathological narcissism not only shares elements of exploitativeness and entitlement with non-pathological narcissism but also encompasses self-esteem that is closely tied to feedback from others, a social muting of arguably undesirable traits, an engagement in prosocial behavior to gain others' affections, a worldview that perceives

oneself to have great power and superiority, and a tendency toward diminishing the accomplishments of oneself and of others (Pincus et al., 2009). Additionally, pathological narcissism emphasizes the suppression of one's true attitudes as well as the engagement in socially desirable acts in an effort either to garner positive feedback or to avoid rejection from others (Pincus et al., 2009). Along with this suppression of self, a sense of resentment toward others accompanies pathological narcissism (Pincus et al., 2009). In contrast to non-pathological narcissism, the pathological variation of narcissism is negatively associated with self-esteem (Barry & Kauten, 2014; Pincus et al., 2009). It also maintains positive correlations with both proactive and reactive aggression (Barry & Kauten, 2014; Pincus et al., 2009), anxiety, depression, and social stress (Barry & Kauten, 2014). In addition, pathological and non-pathological narcissism tend to be uncorrelated or minimally correlated with each other, further emphasizing that they measure unique variants of narcissism (Barry & Kauten, 2014; Roche, Pincus, Lukowitsky, Ménard, & Conroy, 2013).

Within the construct of pathological narcissism are two dimensions: grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. Grandiose narcissism consists of self-enhancing traits and tendencies to manipulate interaction partners to one's own benefit, whereas vulnerable narcissism reflects a fragile self-worth accompanied by anger and irritability when threatened (Pincus et al., 2009). Furthermore, grandiose elements of narcissism are demonstrated via intrusive interaction styles, whereas vulnerable elements are presented as avoidant and vindictive (Pincus et al., 2009). Given the moderate to high interrelation between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, these two seemingly contradictory styles of narcissism may exist simultaneously. The same individual may present in certain

contexts as self-assured and arrogant while acting aggressively when his or her self-esteem is threatened. Pincus and Roche (2011) explain that narcissistic grandiosity motivates the individual to seek out opportunities to be valued and appreciated, which in turn increases the likelihood of rejection, at which point narcissistic vulnerability is exhibited.

Although narcissistic grandiosity may appear to present similarly to non-pathological narcissism, one noteworthy discrepancy between non-pathological and pathological narcissism concerns their associations with self-esteem. Specifically, as discussed above, non-pathological narcissism reflects the colloquial sense of narcissism that is accompanied by an apparently elevated self-esteem (Emmons, 1987). On the other hand, contingent self-esteem has been linked to pathological narcissism (e.g., Maxwell, Donnellan, Hopwood, & Ackerman, 2011; Pincus et al., 2009). In this conceptualization, the grandiose self-confidence put forth by individuals characterized by a narcissistic personality pattern appears to be a façade. The premise of self-worth, then, with regard to pathological narcissism, is a weak foundation on which the interpersonal identity is built.

Despite the emphasis on self-involvement and egocentrism in the discussion of narcissism, it is important to consider that narcissism does not necessarily preclude awareness of others. Rather, a sense of what others need or will admire may be particularly heightened, as it links back to the individual's own social standing. Therefore, individuals characterized by narcissism may use several mechanisms to manipulate others' perceptions. To this end, pathological narcissism has been described as an ineffective self-regulatory mechanism (Roche et al., 2013). Specifically, Roche and



colleagues (2013) note that “other people are needed for the narcissist to self-enhance, but the devalued and skeptical view of others limits [his or her] ability to experience others’ praise and validation as self-enhancing” (p. 238). Thus, the worldview associated with narcissism is limiting and paradoxical. For the narcissistic personality pattern to be successful interpersonally, the individual must adapt to his or her social environment. Roche and colleagues (2013) found that individuals high on non-pathological narcissism are able to self-regulate through mechanisms such as exhibiting extraversion, pride, and conscientiousness, whereas individuals high in pathological narcissism make efforts at regulating their self-concept through guilt, neuroticism, and dependence on others.

### CHAPTER III

#### AGGRESSION AND PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR

As noted above, both pathological and non-pathological narcissism are correlated with adolescent aggression (Barry & Kauten, 2014; Thomaes, Stegge, Olthof, Bushman, & Nezlek, 2011). Several theories have been put forth to explain this relation in various circumstances. Individuals with narcissistic tendencies have been shown to lash out when their ego has been threatened (c.f., Thomaes et al., 2011). Presumably, an individual with high levels of narcissism is driven to engage in aggression following an ego threat to regain superiority over the threatening individual and recalibrate his or her self-esteem. This premise is similar to that made by Williams (2007) that a social threat, such as ostracism, results in the victim being motivated to regain control of his or her own sense of belonging and self-esteem. Given that vigilance regarding such perceived threats seems omnipresent with regard to narcissism, the desire to establish one's social worth, through a number of strategies, is likely amplified.

Narcissism has also been linked to aggressive behavior without provocation (Fossati, Borroni, Eisenberg, Maffei, 2010; Reidy, Foster, & Zeichner, 2010). Reidy and colleagues (2010) argue that unprovoked aggression (i.e., proactive aggression), although not explicitly tied to the common concept of ego threat, could be a reaction to a constant hyperawareness of potential ego threats and negative evaluations. Additionally, proactive aggression may be used as a preemptive tool to express dominance over others (Fossati et al., 2010) and to obtain social rewards such as elevated social status (Golmaryami & Barry, 2010).

Both self- and peer-reported prosocial behavior have demonstrated links with one particular element of the narcissistic personality: Self-Sacrificing Self-Enhancement (Kauten & Barry, 2014). This domain of pathological narcissism lends itself to involvement in prosocial behavior, as it is characterized by a willingness to ingratiate oneself to others to gain favor (Pincus et al., 2009). Other elements of narcissism, such as Exploitativeness, reflect manipulative behavior designed to engender personal gains (Pincus et al., 2009). Regardless of motive, such tendencies may be associated with certain socially desirable behaviors that are intended to earn social rewards.

That narcissism has shown a relation to self-reported prosocial behavior is not altogether surprising. The charismatic and charming face of narcissism (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002), combined with the desperate need for admiration (Pincus et al., 2009), may drive an individual with high levels of narcissism to engage in societally beneficial behaviors in an effort to earn positive social appraisals. A previous study (Kauten & Barry, 2014) suggested that an association between narcissism and prosocial behavior may be based on one of several processes. First, the fragile self-esteem, associated with pathological narcissism, could prompt an individual with narcissistic tendencies to seek out opportunities to increase or stabilize his or her self-esteem. Alternatively, individuals high on non-pathological narcissism, marked by relatively high self-esteem (Barry et al., 2003) and good interpersonal skills (Hill & Lapsley, 2011), may be more likely to engage in prosocial acts as a function of their outgoing nature, or given that they perceive themselves to be uniquely capable of fulfilling the needs of another individual. Finally, some individuals high in narcissism may be particularly adept with the skills necessary to perceive the needs of others and determine how to adequately meet

these needs. This study further investigated the latter suggestion. Perhaps, individuals high on narcissism engage in prosocial behavior, particularly, if they have greater emotional or social intelligence, which allows them to successfully manipulate the perceptions of others. However, a replication of previous results (i.e., parent- and peer-reported prosocial behavior being unrelated to narcissism) would insinuate that such individuals are ineffective at impression management.

## CHAPTER IV

### EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

One potential factor that could facilitate the connection between adolescent narcissism and prosocial behavior is emotional intelligence. Emotional intelligence is imperative, for example, to obtain knowledge of others' social needs and prepare action to fulfill those needs (Rieck & Callahan, 2013). Therefore, perception of others' social desires for action may lend itself to a role in the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior, insofar as the prosocial behavior facilitates the accomplishment of narcissistic interpersonal goals.

Emotional intelligence is composed of an amalgamation of self- and other-knowing qualities that help facilitate social reciprocity (Bar-On, 2006). In short, emotional intelligence encompasses the ability to recognize emotions, to control emotions, and to "solve emotionally laden problems" (Van Rooy, Viswesvaran, & Pluta, 2005, p. 448). Emotional intelligence, then, may facilitate a more accurate perception of the interaction partner's desires, thus allowing for more skillful manipulation and impression management.

High levels of emotional intelligence have been associated with prosocial behavior and with lower levels of antisocial behavior (Petrides, Sangareau, Furnham, & Frederickson, 2006). Additionally, youth who self-reported higher levels of emotional intelligence received more peer nominations related to cooperation and leadership tendencies and fewer nominations related to disruption, aggression, and dependence (Petrides et al., 2006). Kimonis, Frick, Muñoz, and Aucoin (2007) found that youth who were elevated on self-reported callous-unemotional (CU) tendencies and low with regard

to self-reported emotional intelligence reported a higher frequency of aggression and violence than their peers. Therefore, it appears that high levels of self-reported emotional intelligence may protect against involvement in violence, aggression, and delinquent behaviors.

The literature has offered different conclusions regarding the relation between narcissism and emotional intelligence. Vonk, Zeigler-Hill, Mayhew, and Mercer (2013) suggest that, in theory, self-absorption is embodied in an inability to take the emotional perspective of others, though for narcissistic individuals, perspective-taking may be a useful tool in manipulating others. Petrides and colleagues (Petrides, Vernon, Schermer, & Veselka, 2011) found that global emotional intelligence is positively related to non-pathological narcissism in adults, as measured by the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. Despite the hubris and egocentrism characteristic of narcissism, some specific facets of narcissism may be especially associated with emotional intelligence. For example, individuals who score highly on measures of pathological narcissism rely on others to maintain their self-esteem (Pincus et al., 2009). Therefore, it would be particularly beneficial to individuals with such tendencies to attend to the emotions of those around them, such that they may behave appropriately to receive positive regard from others via strategic manipulation of others' perceptions. Accordingly, Vonk and colleagues (Vonk et al., 2013) found that individuals who self-reported high levels of pathological grandiosity, in particular, also reported adeptness related to perspective-taking, social reasoning, emotional intelligence, and empathy. However, it is important to note that, with regard to narcissism especially, self-report measures may invite exaggeration of socially desirable features in an effort to present oneself positively.

It is plausible that elevated levels of emotional intelligence could enhance the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior. In particular, emotional intelligence as a skill may be useful for individuals with narcissistic tendencies, such that the ability to accurately perceive others' needs may increase the likelihood of engagement in prosocial behavior, thus reflecting the presumed beneficence of the helper.

## CHAPTER V

### SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE

Social intelligence has been broadly defined as the “ability to understand and manage people” (Thorndike & Stein, 1937, as cited by Crowne, 2009, p. 105). Although social and emotional intelligence are related, factor analyses have suggested that they are distinct constructs (Crowne, 2013). One widely used measure of social intelligence distinguishes three separate components of the construct: social information processing, social skills, and social awareness (Silvera, Martinussen, & Dahl, 2001). In this conceptualization, social information processing involves the understanding of both implicit and explicit verbal and nonverbal messages (Doğan & Çetin, 2009) as well as the “ability to predict someone’s feelings and behavior” (Kinga & Ibolya, 2013, p. 262). Social skills relate to one’s ease at getting along with others in social situations using basic interpersonal skills, and social awareness relates to one’s general awareness of one’s own role in social interactions, specifically with regard to the implications of one’s own behaviors (Delič, Novak, Kovačič, & Avsec, 2011).

In previous research, narcissism has shown positive correlations with the social information processing and social skills components of social intelligence (Delič, et al., 2011). However, in the same study, narcissism was unrelated to social awareness, indicating that although narcissistic individuals may be competent in reading and predicting the behavior of others and in using certain social skills to interact with others, they are not necessarily aware of others’ reactions to, or perceptions of, their behavior in the moment. Alternatively, Carlson and colleagues (Carlson, Naumann, & Vazire, 2011) determined that narcissistic individuals are aware that their own perceptions of



themselves are discrepant from the perceptions of others. Overall, the evidence suggests that narcissistic individuals engage in social interactions with ease, though most social relationships of individuals with elevated levels of narcissism are relatively short-lived (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Theoretically, the charisma, characteristic of narcissism, acts to engage interaction partners, although the problematic behaviors associated with excessive egotism negatively impact the relationship (Küfner, Nestler, & Back, 2012).

In general, high levels of social intelligence are linked to a persona that is “well-liked” and at-ease in social situations (Silvera et al., 2001). In short, this profile reflects the initial perception of an individual high on narcissistic traits. However, minimal research has directly examined narcissism and social intelligence simultaneously, and thus far, research examining the relation between narcissism and social intelligence has focused primarily on the non-pathological conceptualization of narcissism (Delič et al., 2011).

Furthermore, research has not yet examined the implications of social intelligence for engagement in prosocial behaviors, though the likelihood for such engagement is perhaps magnified when an individual possesses increased awareness of the needs of others. Given the established relation between narcissism and social intelligence (Delič et al., 2011), it is likely that an individual high on these traits may engage in prosocial behavior through utilization of social skills and manipulating the needs of others in an ultimate effort to garner positive feedback. Therefore, it is possible that elevated levels of social intelligence may influence the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior.

## CHAPTER VI

### MEASUREMENT OF PROSOCIAL BEHAVIOR AND MULTI-INFORMANT PERSPECTIVES

It is important to note that the validity of data gathered from self-report measures is questionable, as socially desirable responding may influence responses and relations between constructs. For example, respondents may seek to minimize the reflection of undesirable personality traits while emphasizing their engagement in prosocial behaviors. However, Paunonen and LeBel (2012) found that biased, or socially desirable, responding does not largely influence one's scores on self-report measures of personality. Similarly, in adolescent samples, similar to those that were used in the current study, the distribution of self-reported narcissism has been approximately normal (Barry, Pickard, & Ansel, 2009). However, given the tendency of individuals elevated on narcissism to engage in impression management to receive positive feedback (Pincus et al., 2009), investigating socially desirable responding may help to clarify the motivation driving responses to self-report measures as a function of narcissism.

The debate remains whether biased responding influences the relation between narcissism and self-reported prosocial behavior. In previous research, a relation emerged between pathological narcissism and self-reported prosocial behavior, although peer-reported prosocial behavior failed to display the same effect (Kauten & Barry, 2014). These results beg the question of whether individuals who endorse elevated levels of narcissistic traits do, in fact, behave prosocially, or whether they simply report engagement in prosocial behavior as a result of their own perceptions of their behavior or in an effort to bolster their own fragile self-esteem. Therefore, an alternative to behavior

rating scales may help clarify whether narcissistic individuals' endorsement of prosocial tendencies is genuine or an artifact of desirable responding. The inclusion of multiple measures of prosocial behavior should help address the issue of whether reports of prosocial behavior reflect actual engagement in such behavior.

Research using multiple informants has attempted to resolve this issue. However, it is likely that, given the previous results suggesting that narcissism is not related to parent and peer reports of prosocial behavior, relatively narcissistic adolescents are ineffective in the use of prosocial behavior as a self-enhancement strategy (Kauten & Barry, 2014). However, the confidence and interpersonal skill associated with non-pathological narcissism may make attempts at prosocial behavior, a more viable option for individuals with high levels of this form of narcissism. Several authors have noted that adolescent prosocial behavior takes distinct forms in parent, sibling, and peer relationships (c.f., Eberly Lewis, 2014; Kumru & Yagmurlu, 2014; Wentzel, 2014). Individuals who endorse elevated levels of narcissism, in particular, may consider several behaviors to be differentially advantageous, depending on the context of the relationship in which these behaviors are performed, and they may engage in prosocial behavior solely when they feel that they may reap social benefits. For example, adolescents may consider that parents or authority figures provide the appropriate context for engagement in prosocial behavior, as these relationships may be more likely to bestow social rewards. Alternately, in peer relationships, it may be more advantageous for the adolescent to use aggression to communicate authority and dominance (Bogart, Benotsch, & Pavlovic, 2004; Emmons, 1987). Thus, investigation of prosocial behavior from various

perspectives helps to develop a more comprehensive and accurate perspective of adolescents' actual behavior.

Thus far, research has typically measured prosocial behavior, primarily, via self-report (c.f., Cadenhead & Richman, 1996; Carlo & Randall, 2002). Though self-report measures are valuable, they may be prone to biased reporting or impression management. Researchers have also coded prosocial behavior through behavioral observations, staged donations (Twenge, Baumeister, DeWall, Ciarocco, & Bartels, 2007), or vignettes prompting prosocial or non-prosocial responses (Saroglou, Pichon, Trompette, Verschueren, & Dernelle, 2005). The investigation of prosocial tendencies beyond rating scales may help clarify whether self-reports by individuals elevated on narcissism (Kauten & Barry, 2014) are reflective of their behavior. Such a measure also precludes a reliance on information that is filtered through the observations of others such as parents and peers. The use of questions regarding volunteer behavior as a proxy for prosociality, in particular, allows for a noninvasive and uncomplicated means of gathering a presumed approximation of one's behavior. The present study used the technique of providing normative information of volunteer hours, typically conducted by one's peers and by asking participants how much they would like to volunteer in comparison. An added component of recognition for extensive volunteer work was meant to examine whether narcissistic involvement in prosocial behavior was motivated by external validation (i.e., whether intention to engage in prosocial behavior increased if the behavior was to be publicly recognized).

## CHAPTER VII

### PRESENT STUDY

The correlation between narcissism and aggression has been thoroughly researched, but more recent findings have reported a connection between adolescent pathological narcissism and self-reported prosocial behavior (Kauten & Barry, 2014). The purpose of the current study was threefold. First, it sought to replicate the previous study that uncovered a relation between adolescent narcissism and self-reported prosocial behavior (Kauten & Barry, 2014). Second, this study examined the relation between two primary conceptualizations of adolescent narcissism (i.e., pathological and non-pathological) and different indices of prosocial behavior (self-, parent-, peer-report, and behavioral intentions), as moderated by emotional and social intelligence. Furthermore, the study investigated the similarities between rating scales, peer nominations, and a behavioral proxy of prosocial behavior (i.e., ideal volunteer hours, desire to volunteer if behavior was/was not recognized publically). Socially desirable responding was also examined, as such response tendencies may be particularly evident in individuals with high levels of narcissism as an effort to self-enhance and manage the impressions of others.

The developmental period of adolescence is of particular interest, as this period is one of identity development wherein status and relationship goals differentially predict aggressive and prosocial behaviors (Kiefer & Ryan, 2008; Ojanen Findley, & Fuller, 2012; Ojanen, Gronroos, & Salmivalli, 2005). Although the stability of personality traits from this period through adulthood is varied (c.f., Donnellan, Conger, & Burzette, 2007), it may be possible to determine the specific factors that increase the likelihood of

prosocial behavior and target these areas for intervention. Such efforts may have an additional impact, insofar as engagement in prosocial behavior may be incompatible with aggression.

### Hypotheses

Despite the lack of a relation in previous research (Kauten & Barry, 2014), it was hypothesized that non-pathological narcissism, based upon its associated interpersonal skill and charisma (Barry & Wallace, 2010; Hill & Lapsley, 2011), would be positively correlated with prosocial behavior across self-, parent-, and peer- reports and behavioral approximations of prosocial behavior (i.e., ideal volunteer hours, preference to engage in prosocial behavior with or without recognition; Hypothesis 1). Based on the fragile sense of self and tendency toward devaluing others, associated with vulnerable narcissism, this construct was expected to be negatively associated with self-, parent-, and peer-reported prosocial behavior (Hypothesis 2). It was hypothesized that grandiose narcissism would be positively correlated with self- and parent-reported prosocial behavior due to the tendency of individuals high on these traits to use aggression to demonstrate superiority over peers and presumably other means to reach social goals in interactions with parents (Hypothesis 3). Given that the existing relation between pathological narcissism and prosocial behavior is thought to be largely an artifact of self-report, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were expected to be negatively associated with behavioral approximations of intent to engage in prosocial behavior (Hypothesis 4).

Additionally, it was expected that both pathological and non-pathological narcissism would be positively associated with emotional intelligence, as such a skill would likely serve such individuals well in their ultimate goal to manipulate the

perceptions of others (Hypothesis 5). Due to the social skills characteristic of non-pathological narcissism (Barry & Wallace, 2010) and its relation with social intelligence (Delič et al., 2011), this construct was expected to be positively associated with social intelligence (Hypothesis 6), whereas pathological narcissism, characterized by a more fragile sense of self that is easily wavered, was expected to be negatively correlated with social intelligence (Hypothesis 7). It was expected that for non-pathological and pathological (i.e., both grandiose and vulnerable) narcissism, emotional intelligence would strengthen the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior (Hypothesis 8). Although a direct relation was not expected for pathological narcissism, it was hypothesized that social intelligence would strengthen the relation between both pathological and non-pathological narcissism and prosocial behavior (Hypothesis 9). Gender, ethnicity, and social desirability were controlled for in correlational and moderation analyses, if they were significantly correlated with measures of prosocial behavior.

## CHAPTER VIII

### METHOD

#### Participants

A total of 212 adolescents ranging in age from 16 to 19 years ( $M$  age = 16.8 years,  $SD = .77$ ; 175 males, 34 females, 3 missing gender data) who were enrolled in a voluntary residential program for youth who have dropped out of high school agreed to participate in this study. The majority of participants were Caucasian (52.5%), 32.5% identified as African American, and 1.3% identified as “Other,” whereas 13.8% were missing ethnicity data. Adolescents enrolled in this program have dropped out of school for several reasons, including behavioral, academic, family, or financial issues. Approximately 220 adolescents were enrolled in the program; thus, the approximate response rate for adolescent self-report data was 96.36%. However, many adolescents did not complete the full study (see below).

A total of 149 parents provided reports of their adolescents’ prosocial behavior. The response rate was approximately 70.28% for parent-report. Only a subset of participants was invited to participate in the peer nomination procedure (i.e., 4 randomly selected platoons out of 7 from the residential program). A total of 122 individuals agreed to participate in that portion of the study (86 males, 33 females, 3 missing gender data). Of the 212 adolescent participants who began the data collection, 147 (120 males, 27 females; 54.4% Caucasian, 28.6% African American, 0.7% Other, 16.3% missing ethnicity data) completed all of the relevant self-report data (i.e., background, NPIC, PNI, PTM, TEIQ-ASF, TSIS), and were included in analyses pertaining to self-reported prosocial behavior and emotional and social intelligence. In independent samples  $t$ -tests



comparing individuals who did (120 males, 27 females; 54.4% Caucasian, 28.6% African-American, 0.7% “Other,” 16.3% missing ethnicity data) and did not (55 males, 6 females, 4 missing gender data; 12.3% Caucasian; 23.1% African American, 64.6% missing ethnicity data) complete all relevant self-report data on the primary variables, it was found that on average, participants who did not complete all self-report data ( $M = 59.88$ ,  $se = 2.72$ ) reported higher levels of non-pathological narcissism than those who did complete all of the relevant measures ( $M = 52.64$ ,  $se = 1.53$ ),  $t(178) = -2.08$ ,  $p = .04$ . No other significant differences emerged between these groups on any of the self-reported data (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, pathological narcissism, prosocial behavior). Only 88 individuals (77 males, 11 females) had matching self- and parent-reported prosocial behavior data as well as self-reports of emotional and social intelligence and were included in relevant regression analyses. Lastly, 75 participants had matching self- and peer-reports of prosocial behavior in addition to self-reported emotional and social intelligence and were included in regression analyses predicting peer-reported prosocial behavior.

### Measures

*Pathological Narcissism Inventory* (PNI; Pincus et al., 2009).

The PNI is a 52-item measure of pathological narcissism, which has been determined to be especially problematic in terms of its emotional and behavioral correlates in adolescents (Barry & Kauten, 2014). On the PNI, participants rate their agreement with each statement on a Likert-type scale from 0 (“not at all like me”) to 5 (“very much like me”). The overall scale may be separated into component scales, including the two overarching dimensions, Grandiose and Vulnerable narcissism, and

seven factors (i.e., Contingent Self-Esteem, Exploitativeness, Self-Sacrificing Self-Enhancement, Hiding the Self, Grandiose Fantasy, Devaluing the Self and Others, and Entitlement Rage).

In previous research, the PNI Grandiose and Vulnerable scales have shown significant positive relations with tendencies toward manipulation of others, placing high value on reputation and appearance, and unique self-perceptions (Thomas, Wright, Lukowitsky, Donnellan, & Hopwood, 2012), all of which are consistent with this particular conceptualization of narcissism. Furthermore, pathological narcissism as a whole has been negatively related to self-esteem and positively related to proactive aggression, anxiety, depression, social stress, and contingent self-worth in adolescents (Barry & Kauten, 2014). Despite having some common criterion relations, the Grandiose and Vulnerable scales have demonstrated somewhat unique correlates. For example, narcissistic vulnerability has been associated with depressed affect and suicidality, whereas the dysfunction of narcissistic grandiosity is connected to exhibitionism and playing out grandiose fantasies (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). This measure has demonstrated adequate internal consistency in a previous adolescent sample ( $\alpha = .92$ ; Barry & Kauten, 2014) with individual subscale coefficient alphas ranging from .75 to .92 in initial validation work (Pincus et al., 2009). In the present study, the internal consistency of the composite score was  $\alpha = .94$ . Internal consistency of the Grandiose scale was  $\alpha = .89$ , and the internal consistency of the Vulnerable scale was  $\alpha = .92$ .

*Narcissism Personality Inventory for Children* (NPIC; Barry et al., 2003).

The NPIC is a downward extension of the Narcissism Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1979). The NPIC consists of 40 items for which individuals determine

which of two sentences is most like them and then to what degree the chosen sentence represents their behaviors and attitudes (i.e., “sort of true” versus “really true”). The NPIC has been used extensively in past research, especially in residential adolescent samples similar to that which was used in the current study. Specifically, the composite score from the NPIC has been associated with aggression (Golmaryami & Barry, 2010), delinquency, and both overt and relational aggression (Barry, Grafeman, Adler, & Pickard, 2007). It has also been positively associated with the perceived quality of interpersonal relationships and self-esteem (Barry & Wallace, 2010). In a small sample of previous studies, internal consistencies have varied between  $\alpha = .82$  (Barry et al., 2007; Barry & Wallace, 2010) and  $\alpha = .89$  (Golmaryami & Barry, 2010). The present study yielded an internal consistency of  $\alpha = .87$  for the total score.

*Prosocial Tendencies Measure* (PTM; Carlo & Randall, 2002).

The PTM evaluates an individual’s tendencies toward helping behaviors. The measure, which was normed in a sample of college students ( $M$  age = 19.89 years), includes six dimensions of prosocial behavior (i.e., Anonymous, Public, Altruism, Emotional, Compliant, Dire). Participants rate each of the 20 items (e.g., “I can help others best when people are watching me”) on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (“Does not describe me at all”) to 5 (“Describes me greatly”). The current sample was somewhat younger, on average, than the normed sample, so three items (e.g., “I believe that donating goods or money works best when it is tax-deductible;” “I prefer to donate money anonymously;” “I often make anonymous donations because they make me feel good”) were omitted from the measure based on their developmental inappropriateness for participants in the age range used in this study.

In the initial development of the PTM, internal consistency for subscales ranged from  $\alpha = .74$  to  $\alpha = .85$  (Carlo & Randall, 2002), and use with a similar residential adolescent sample has demonstrated internal consistency of  $\alpha = .85$  for the total score (Kauten & Barry, 2014). Previous research has also demonstrated relations between several of the PTM subscales and various indicators of cognitive (e.g., moral reasoning, perspective-taking, empathetic accuracy), emotional, and behavioral (e.g., sympathy, ascription of responsibility) functioning for individuals in both early and middle adolescence (Carlo, Hausmann, Christiansen, & Randall, 2003; Carlo & Randall, 2002). In the present sample, internal consistency was  $\alpha = .87$ .

*Prosocial Tendencies Measure - Parent Report* (Carlo & Randall, 2002).

The adolescent self-report version of the PTM was modified for parent-report. The measure was similar to the original PTM such that parents rated their adolescent's behavior on a scale of 1 ("Does not describe my child at all") to 5 ("Describes my child greatly"). Items were altered to reflect the parent as the informant (e.g., "*My child* can help others best when others are watching *him or her*"). This modified measure has been used previously in a similar sample, with the internal consistency of the overall score of  $\alpha = .82$  (Kauten, 2013). The present sample yielded an internal consistency of  $\alpha = .86$ .

*Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire – Adolescent Short Form* (TEIQ-ASF; Petrides et al., 2006).

The TEIQ-ASF is a 30-item self-report measure for youth ages 11 through 18 derived from the adult form of the same questionnaire. To be more appropriate for use with adolescent samples, the original measure was simplified to facilitate comprehension. Youth rate their agreement with each item (e.g., "I can control my anger when I want to")

on a 7-point Likert scale with responses ranging from 1 (Disagree) to 7 (Agree). Several items (e.g., “I don’t know how to show the people close to me that I care about them”) are reverse scored. In samples of Spanish, Greek, and English adolescents, the internal consistencies for the total scores were  $\alpha = .82$  (Ferrando et al., 2011),  $\alpha = .89$  (Poulou, 2010), and  $\alpha = .82$  (Frederickson, Petrides, & Simmonds, 2012), respectively.

Furthermore, emotional intelligence has been positively associated, as would be expected, with prosocial behavior, and negatively associated with psychopathology (e.g., hyperactivity, conduct problems, and mood symptoms; Frederickson et al., 2012).

Internal consistency for the total score in the current sample was  $\alpha = .83$ .

*Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale* (Silvera et al., 2001).

The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale is a 21-item self-report measure of one’s ability to accurately and effectively perceive and manage others’ emotions and behaviors in an interpersonal setting. Three subscale scores (i.e., Social Information Processing, Social Skills, Social Awareness) may be derived in addition to a composite score. Scores for each of the scales and for the composite score are computed by averaging across the item scores.

For each item (e.g., “I can often understand what others are trying to accomplish without the need for them to say anything”), respondents rate their perceived competence on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 1 indicating extremely poor perceived skill and 7 suggesting that they feel that they grasp the skill extremely well. Based on the initial development of the scale, this measure is not susceptible to social desirability, as no items demonstrated significant correlations with an established measure of social desirability, and initial exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses supported the three-scale

approach to measurement of this construct (Silvera et al., 2001). Although minimal research has been conducted with regard to the validity of this measure, it is arguably the most widely used measure of social intelligence in relatively recent research (Delič et al., 2011; Meijs, Cillessen, Scholte, Segers, & Spijkerman, 2008). The total score was of particular interest in the current study, and internal consistency was  $\alpha = .70$ . The internal consistency for Social Information Processing was  $\alpha = .83$ . Internal consistency for the Social Skills subscale was  $\alpha = .47$ , and the internal consistency for the Social Awareness subscale was  $\alpha = .71$ .

In the present sample, Social Information Processing was significantly related to Social Skills,  $r = .31, p < .001$ . Social Awareness was also significantly related to Social Skills,  $r = .22, p = .01$ . Social Awareness and Social Information Processing were not significantly correlated,  $r = .14, p = .09$ , which is discrepant from previous research (Silvera et al., 2001).

*Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding* (Paulhus, 1988).

The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR) is a 40-item self-report measure of deceptive positivity and impression management. Participants rate their agreement with each item on a Likert-type scale ranging from “Not True” to “Very True” as it reflects their own thoughts and perceptions. Items reflect socially desirable behaviors (e.g., “I have done things that I don’t tell other people about;” “When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening”), generally worded as extremes (e.g., “always” and “never”), that most individuals would admit to breaking on occasion. Higher levels of socially desirable responding are indicated by a pattern of extreme responses (i.e., ranking several items as “Not True” or “Very True” depending on the direction of item

wording). The BIDR may be broken down into two separate subscales: Impression Management (IM) and Self-Deceptive Enhancement (SDE). Although each of these subscales may be investigated in terms of participant response styles, analyses were completed at the total score level, as general desirable responding was the primary construct of interest. The internal consistency of the present study ( $\alpha = .80$ ) was commensurate with previous research (Li & Baggar, 2007).

*Peer nominations of prosocial behavior* (see Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

The peer nomination procedure used in the current study is based on the procedure used by Crick and Grotpeter (1995). Through this measure, a group of adolescents is given the opportunity to nominate individuals in their peer group for a series of 15 behavioral or personality attributes (e.g., “Good leader;” “Does nice things for others”). Participants may nominate up to three of their peers for each category. Although the measure allows for nomination in the areas of relational aggression, overt aggression, prosocial behavior, and isolation, the five items assessing prosocial behavior (i.e., “Good leader;” “Does nice things for others;” “Helps others;” “Cheers up others;” “Seems happy”) are of particular interest for this study. In the completion of this procedure for the current study, participants were separated according to their platoons within the residential setting (25-34 individuals;  $M = 30.5$ ) and were asked to nominate only peers in their own platoon. Internal consistency of prosocial nominations in a similar sample has been adequate ( $\alpha = .85$ ; Kauten & Barry, 2014). Similarly, internal consistency for the present sample was  $\alpha = .85$ .

## Procedure

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained prior to the beginning of data collection. The current study was also approved by the director of the residential program where it was conducted. When parents/guardians enrolled their adolescent in the residential program, they were asked to provide informed consent for their participation and for their adolescent to be contacted about the study. Consenting parents then completed the PTM-P. Approximately 6 weeks after the youth began the program, they were given the opportunity to agree or decline to participate in the study. Adolescents in the residential program are separated into platoons of approximately 30-35 individuals. Individuals from a platoon, who agreed to participate were separated further across three classrooms where computers were available. Participants completed a series of questionnaires including the PNI, NPIC, PTM, TEIQ-ASF, Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale, and BIDR through the Qualtrics online survey system. For the reported intentions to engage in specific prosocial behaviors, participants were asked about how many hours they would ideally volunteer if they had a choice compared with the average volunteer time of 50 hours. They were also asked the degree to which they would be interested in volunteering, on a scale of 1 (very uninterested) to 5 (very interested), an extra 30 hours in exchange for their name being made public, and the degree to which they would be interested in volunteering for an extra 30 minutes each day for one week, though they would receive no recognition for this relatively smaller commitment. Self-report measures were completed across approximately four sessions over the span of approximately two weeks as part of a larger research project. Approximately six weeks after completing self-report questionnaires, some participants



were invited to complete the peer nomination procedure in small groups. Specifically, four platoons (3 male platoons and the only female platoon) were invited to participate in this portion of the study, with the male platoons being randomly selected.

## CHAPTER IX

### RESULTS

#### Preliminary Analyses

Data were filtered to include individuals who completed data relevant to the given analysis. For example, analyses involving only self-report data included individuals who completed the NPIC, PNI, TSIS, TEIQ, PTM, and BIDR ( $N = 147$ ). Analyses that were pertinent to parent-report data included participants who had all of the following measures: NPIC, PNI, TSIS, TEIQ, and PTM-P ( $N = 88$ ), and those that related to peer-report data included participants who had completed all self-report data as well as the peer nomination procedure ( $N = 75$ ).

Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 1. Variables were generally normally distributed; however, peer nominations for prosocial behavior were positively skewed. In other words, many participants were nominated few, if any, times by their peers for demonstrating prosocial behavior, whereas some individuals received a relatively high number of nominations. Participants' reports of ideal number of volunteer hours were also significantly skewed such that several individuals provided extreme responses in the positive direction (i.e., up to 1000 hours). To account for the extreme responses on this variable, values greater than 4 standard deviations from the mean (i.e.,  $> 438.45$ ) were excluded from relevant analyses, which resulted in one individual being excluded from analyses involving this variable.

Table 1

*Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables*

Variable (Possible Range)	<i>N</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness (Std Error)	Kurtosis (Std Error)
Non-Pathological Narcissism (0 to 120)	147	12.00	113.00	52.64	18.59	.79 (.20)	-.09 (.40)
Pathological Narcissism (0 to 5)	147	.29	4.01	2.23	.81	-.03 (.20)	-.47 (.40)
Grandiose Narcissism (0 to 5)	147	.31	4.61	2.53	.91	-.04 (.20)	-.30 (.40)
Vulnerable Narcissism (0 to 5)	147	.22	4.22	1.93	.88	.14 (.20)	-.64 (.40)
Ideal Volunteer Hours	129	0.00	1000.00	65.77	93.17	8.28 (.21)	80.98 (.43)
Willingness to volunteer (Public; 1 to 5)	147	1.00	5.00	3.67	1.37	-.78 (.20)	-.57 (.40)
Willingness to volunteer (Private; 1 to 5)	147	1.00	5.00	2.97	1.29	-.09 (.20)	-.98 (.40)
Prosocial Behavior (Self-report; 1 to 5)	147	1.10	4.75	2.89	.70	-.05 (.20)	.36 (.40)
Prosocial Behavior (Parent-report; 1 to 5)	88	1.20	5.00	2.82	.68	.01 (.26)	.42 (.51)
Prosocial Behavior (Peer Report)	75	-.88	3.49	.16	.94	1.01 (.28)	.83 (.55)

Table 1 (continued).

Variable (Possible Range)	<i>N</i>	Minimum	Maximum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness (Std Error)	Kurtosis (Std Error)
Emotional Intelligence (30 to 210)	147	57.00	185.00	132.68	24.43	-.45 (.20)	.26 (.40)
Social Intelligence (1 to 7)	147	2.29	6.48	4.24	.73	.05 (.20)	.27 (.40)

*Note.* Peer-reported prosocial behavior was calculated using the sum of nominations from each item on the prosocial behavior scale of the peer nomination measure and z-scoring that sum within groups.

To determine whether adolescents' reports of prosocial were inflated, compared with parent- and peer-reports of prosocial behavior as a function of narcissism, difference scores were created. Self-reported and parent-reported prosocial behavior were standardized so that they would be in the same metric as peer-reported prosocial behavior. Next, a self-parent inflation score was created by subtracting the parent-report standardized scores from self-report standardized scores. The same procedure was repeated to create a self-peer inflation score. Correlational analyses were conducted to examine whether a relation emerged between inflation scores and variables of interest. Results are displayed in Table 2. Of note, the self-peer inflation score was significantly related to grandiose narcissism,  $r = .41$ ,  $p < .001$ , and vulnerable narcissism,  $r = .28$ ,  $p = .02$ .

Table 2

*Correlations among Inflation Scores and Study Variables*

	Self-Parent Inflation ( <i>N</i> = 88)	Self-Peer Inflation ( <i>N</i> = 75)
Non-pathological	-.13	.21
Narcissism		
Grandiose Narcissism	.10	.41***
Vulnerable Narcissism	.09	.28**
Pathological Narcissism	.10	.38**
Emotional Intelligence	.16	.01
Social Intelligence	.13	.10
Gender	.03	.00
Ethnicity	.02	.13

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ 

Correlational analyses were conducted to determine whether gender, ethnicity, or social desirability were related to any of the measures of prosocial behavior (Table 3). Relations among these variables were not significant, and thus, these variables were not controlled for in further analyses. However, it is notable that in a series of independent samples *t*-test comparing males and females on each of the variables of interest, vulnerable narcissism was higher in females ( $M = 2.48$ ,  $SD = 9.22$ ) than males ( $M = 1.80$ ,  $SD = .83$ ),  $t(145) = -3.52$ ,  $p = .001$ . None of the remaining variables of interest differed by gender.

Table 3

*Correlations among prosocial behavior variables and gender, ethnicity, and social desirability.*

	Ideal Volunteer Hours (Outlier Excluded) <sup>1</sup>	Willingness to volunteer (Public)	Willingness to volunteer (Private)	Prosocial Behavior (Self- report)	Prosocial Behavior (Parent- report)	Prosocial Behavior (Peer- report)
Gender	-.03	.14	.12	.07	.05	.05
Ethnicity	-.01	.16	-.01	.04	-.28	-.17
Social Desirability	.05	-.07	.05	.08	.09	.19

*Note.* Ethnicity was transformed into a dichotomous variable by differentiating Caucasian (1) from non-Caucasian (2) participants.

Gender was coded such that 1 = male, 2 = female.

### Correlational Analyses

Correlations among the variables of interest (i.e., non-pathological narcissism, pathological narcissism, prosocial behavior, emotional intelligence, social intelligence) are displayed in Table 4. These analyses were conducted with participants who completed all self-report data. Of note, Hypothesis 1 was only partially supported, as non-pathological narcissism was positively associated with parent-reported prosocial behavior,  $r = .24$ ,  $p = .03$ , but it was not correlated with self- or peer-reported prosocial behavior. It was negatively related to ideal volunteer hours,  $r = -.20$ ,  $p = .03$ <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Correlations remained insignificant when the outlier was included in analyses.

<sup>2</sup> When the outlier was included in analyses, non-pathological narcissism and ideal volunteer hours were not significantly correlated,  $r = -.08$ ,  $p = .36$ . In addition, the ideal number of volunteer hours was significantly associated with both desire to volunteer if efforts were,  $r = .19$ ,  $p = .03$ , and were not,  $r = .20$ ,  $p = .02$ , made public with that individual included.

Table 4

*Correlations among study variables*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Non-Pathological Narcissism	1	.37***	.05	-.20*	-.11	-.13	.11	.24*	-.15	.33***	.17
2. Grandiose Narcissism	-	1	.63***	.08	.12	-.01	.39***	.22*	-.13	.05	.08
3. Vulnerable Narcissism	-	-	1	-.10	.08	-.06	.19*	.06	-.23*	-.39***	-.25**
4. Ideal Volunteer Hours (Outlier Excluded)	-	-	-	1	.25**	.17	.14	.11	.09	.14	.19**
5. Willingness to volunteer (Public)	-	-	-	-	1	.56***	.13	.16	-.01	-.06	-.00
6. Willingness to volunteer (Private)	-	-	-	-	-	1	.21*	.23*	.24*	.09	.14
7. Prosocial Behavior (Self)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.29**	-.08	.19*	.25**
8. Prosocial Behavior (parent)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-.00	.05	.07
9. Prosocial Behavior (Peer)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.16	.09
10. Emotional IQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.55***
11. Social IQ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Vulnerable narcissism was significantly positively correlated with self-reported prosocial behavior,  $r = .19, p = .02$ , but not with parent-reported,  $r = .06, p = .61$ , prosocial behavior. It was, however, negatively related to peer-reported prosocial behavior,  $r = -.23, p = .04$ . Thus, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported, and the relation between vulnerable narcissism and self-reported prosocial behavior emerged in the direction opposite of what was hypothesized. Grandiose narcissism was significantly positively related to self-report,  $r = .39, p < .001$ , and parent-report,  $r = .22, p = .04$ , of prosocial behavior, thus providing support for Hypothesis 3. The relations of vulnerable narcissism,  $r = .22, p = .01$ , and grandiose narcissism,  $r = .39, p < .001$ , with self-reported prosocial behavior remained significant when accounting for social desirability. Contrary to the predictions of Hypothesis 4, both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were unrelated to the reported intentions to engage in specific prosocial behaviors.

Non-pathological narcissism was positively related to emotional intelligence,  $r = .33, p < .001$ , in support of Hypothesis 5. Contrary to Hypothesis 5, however, pathological narcissism was negatively associated with emotional intelligence,  $r = -.19, p = .02$ . Hypotheses 6 and 7 were unsupported in that both pathological and non-pathological narcissism were unrelated to social intelligence.

### Regression Analyses

*Emotional Intelligence.* Moderated multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the influence of emotional intelligence on the relations among narcissism and the various indicators of prosocial behavior. To account for 18 regression analyses and correcting for family-wise error, a finding was considered statistically significant if the  $p$  value fell below .003. For each model, a narcissism variable (i.e., non-pathological



narcissism, grandiosity, vulnerability) was entered into the first step of the model along with emotional intelligence. The interaction term between the narcissism variable and emotional intelligence (e.g., non-pathological narcissism x emotional intelligence) was entered into the second step. The dependent variable was prosocial behavior, with the indicator of prosocial behavior (i.e., self-, parent-, peer-report, private willingness to volunteer, willingness to volunteer with public recognition, number of ideal volunteer hours) differing for each analysis. Although analyses were conducted for each of the narcissism variables in conjunction with emotional intelligence to predict each of the indices of prosocial behavior, only significant results are reported. Analyses predicting self-reported indices of prosocial behavior included 147 individuals. Those predicting parent-reported prosocial behavior included 88 cases, and those predicting peer-reported prosocial behavior consisted of data from 75 individuals.

In the analysis examining the predictive utility of grandiose narcissism and emotional intelligence in predicting self-reported prosocial behavior, a main effect emerged in the first step for grandiose narcissism,  $\beta = .38, p < .001$ . The effect for emotional intelligence in the first step and the interaction effect,  $\beta = -.19, p = .70, R^2\Delta = .001$ , were both non-significant. Likewise, for the model using vulnerable narcissism and emotional intelligence to predict self-reported prosocial behavior, main effects emerged in the first step for vulnerable narcissism,  $\beta = .31, p < .001$ , and emotional intelligence,  $\beta = .31, p < .001$ . The interaction effect, however, was not significant,  $\beta = -.09, p = .84, R^2\Delta = .001$ . Given that only main effects emerged and interaction effects were insignificant for all analyses, Hypothesis 8 was not supported.

*Social Intelligence.* The analyses for social intelligence were identical to those for emotional intelligence. Specifically, moderated multiple regression analyses were conducted to examine the hypothesized additive effect of social intelligence on the relations between various forms of narcissism and prosocial behavior outcome variables. Again, a finding was considered statistically significant if the  $p$  value fell below .003. For each model, a narcissism variable (i.e., non-pathological narcissism, grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism) was first entered into the model along with social intelligence. The interaction term between the narcissism variable and social intelligence was entered into the second step. The dependent variable was prosocial behavior from each of the indices used in this study. Only significant results are reported.

In the model using grandiose narcissism and social intelligence to predict self-reported prosocial behavior, a main effect emerged in the first step for grandiose narcissism,  $\beta = .37, p < .001$ . The effect for social intelligence in the first step and the interaction effect,  $\beta = -.79, p = .13, R^2\Delta = .013$ , were both non-significant. The model was repeated using vulnerable narcissism and social intelligence to predict self-reported prosocial behavior. In this analysis, main effects emerged in the first step for vulnerable narcissism,  $\beta = .27, p = .001$ , and social intelligence,  $\beta = .31, p < .001$ . The interaction effect, however, was non-significant,  $\beta = -.46, p = .32, R^2\Delta = .006$ .

In the analysis predicting ideal volunteer hours with the outlier excluded, an interaction effect emerged between grandiose narcissism and social intelligence,  $b = 18.33, se = 5.55, p = .001, R^2\Delta = .08$ . Notably, the interaction effect was not significant when the outlier was included in the analysis. *Post hoc* probing was conducted using the Hayes (2013) PROCESS model in SPSS. These *post hoc* analyses

showed that individuals with high levels of grandiose narcissism combined with high levels of social intelligence reported the desire to volunteer the most hours, and individuals with high levels of narcissism and low levels of social intelligence reported the desire to volunteer the least (Figure 1). Given that one significant interaction effect emerged, Hypothesis 9 was only partially supported.



Figure 1. Interaction between grandiose narcissism and social intelligence to predict self-reported ideal volunteer hours (with outlier excluded).

#### Additional Analyses

*Post hoc* correlational analyses were also conducted between the PTM and the subscales of the PNI to determine which specific elements of narcissism may be related to prosocial behavior. As shown in Table 5, self-reported prosocial behavior was significantly correlated with Exploitativeness,  $r = .26, p = .001$ ; Self-sacrificing Self-enhancement,  $r = .45, p < .001$ ; Hiding the Self,  $r = .19, p = .02$ ; and Grandiose Fantasy,  $r = .20, p = .01$ . Only Self-sacrificing Self-enhancement showed a significant relation with parent-reported prosocial behavior,  $r = .22, p = .03$ .

Table 5

*Relations among prosocial behavior and elements of pathological narcissism.*

	Prosocial Behavior (Self; $N = 147$ )	Prosocial Behavior (Parent; $N = 88$ )
Contingent self-esteem	.14	-.01
Exploitativeness	.26**	.12
Self-sacrificing self-enhancement	.45***	.23*
Hiding the self	.19*	.08
Grandiose fantasy	.20*	.18
Devaluing the self and others	.16	.03
Entitlement	.14	.07

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$

The four subscales of the PNI that were significantly related to self-reported prosocial behavior were entered into a simultaneous regression model to predict self-reported prosociality. In this model, only Self-sacrificing Self-enhancement,  $\beta = .49$ ,  $p < .001$ , and Exploitativeness,  $\beta = .18$ ,  $p = .03$ , predicted unique variance.

In an effort to differentiate self-serving versus altruistic motives of self-reported prosocial behavior, a simultaneous regression model was conducted whereby private volunteer behavior, public volunteer behavior, and self-sacrificing self-enhancement were each entered into a simultaneous regression model to predict self-reported prosocial behavior. Self-sacrificing self-enhancement, in particular, was included in the model based on its reflection of underlying self-serving motives toward engagement in helping behaviors (Pincus et al., 2009) and its unique relation to self-reported prosocial behavior

in the present study. In this model, self-sacrificing self-enhancement,  $\beta = .44, p < .001$ , and private volunteer behavior,  $\beta = .20, p = .02$ , each predicted unique variance in self-reported prosocial behavior. An identical model predicting parent-reported prosocial behavior did not result in any significant predictions.

Given that the measure of social intelligence was composed of three subscales, further analyses were conducted to explore how the various elements of narcissism may be related to Social Information Processing, Social Skills, and Social Awareness. As shown in Table 6 ( $N = 147$ ), non-pathological narcissism was positively related to self-reported Social Skills,  $r = .24, p = .003$ . Grandiose narcissism was negatively correlated with Social Awareness,  $r = -.28, p = .001$ , and was positively correlated with Social Information Processing,  $r = .33, p < .001$ . Finally, vulnerable narcissism was negatively associated with both Social Skills,  $r = -.22, p = .01$ , and Social Awareness,  $r = -.37, p < .001$ .

Table 6

*Correlations among various forms of narcissism and elements of social intelligence*

	Social Information Processing	Social Skills	Social Awareness
Non-pathological narcissism	.15	.24**	-.06
Grandiose narcissism	.33***	.09	-.28**
Vulnerable narcissism	.08	-.22**	-.37***

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$

Non-pathological narcissism, grandiose narcissism, and vulnerable narcissism were then entered into a series of simultaneous regression models to predict each of the subscales of social intelligence to further clarify the relations between the two constructs. In the model for Social Information Processing, grandiose,  $\beta = .47, p < .001$ , and vulnerable narcissism,  $\beta = -.21, p = .04$ , predicted unique variance but in opposite directions. Similarly, in the model predicting Social Skills, grandiose,  $\beta = .29, p = .01$ , and vulnerable narcissism,  $\beta = -.41, p < .001$ , accounted for significant variance in opposite directions. Lastly, only vulnerable narcissism predicted unique variance in the model involving Social Awareness,  $\beta = -.33, p = .002$ .

Regression analyses were then conducted to determine whether emotional and social intelligence could predict various conceptualizations of narcissism. That is, emotional intelligence and social intelligence were entered simultaneously into separate regression models to predict each of the variants of narcissism. Interestingly, emotional intelligence predicted unique variance in the model predicting non-pathological narcissism,  $\beta = .34, p < .001$ , and had a negative predictive effect for vulnerable narcissism,  $\beta = -.37, p < .001$ . Social intelligence did not predict unique variance in any of the models.

## CHAPTER X

### DISCUSSION

The present study demonstrates that narcissism relates differently to prosocial behavior based on the informant and the dimension of narcissism. Non-pathological narcissism was positively related to parent-reported prosocial behavior. Vulnerable narcissism was positively related to self-reported prosocial behavior, and grandiose narcissism was positively related to both self- and parent-reported prosocial behavior. In addition, vulnerable narcissism was negatively correlated with peer-reported prosocial behavior. The results indicate that pathological narcissism translates to self-reports of engaging in positive behavior toward others, even when controlling for socially desirable response styles. Moreover, perhaps narcissistic individuals use different strategies in different types of interpersonal relationships to garner social praise and admiration (Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998) and to express superiority (Fosatti et al., 2010; Thomaes et al., 2011). As noted above, adolescents with narcissistic traits tend to use aggressive strategies to meet their interpersonal goals with their peers (Bogart et al., 2004; Emmons, 1987), and thus, prosociality may not benefit them as much in relationships of relatively equal stature. Alternatively, it could be that narcissistic individuals perceive parents as having access to social rewards and praise; thus, they seek to behave in ways so that they may receive this praise. Such behaviors may be more recognizable to parents as a function of more grandiose or confident displays of narcissism as opposed to the fragile self-perception and guardedness tied to vulnerable narcissism.

It is interesting that grandiose narcissism was significantly related to parent-reported prosocial behavior, suggesting that individuals who exhibit narcissistic traits may be successful in manipulating the perceptions of parents or caretakers. However, it should be noted that such an association was not evident in a previous study with a similar sample of adolescents (Kauten & Barry, 2014). Consistent with that study, peers did not identify narcissistic individuals as being especially prosocial, and in fact, vulnerable narcissism was associated with fewer peer nominations of prosociality. Based on the vulnerable narcissism characteristics of contingent self-worth and disinterest in others who do not provide sufficient validation (Pincus et al., 2009), it is likely that individuals with vulnerable narcissism avoid engagement in prosocial behavior with peers for fear of rejection and/or expectations of a lack of praise and acknowledgement. This finding also indicates that adolescents with these characteristics may not use the same strategies to meet their social needs with parents as with peers.

In terms of specific characteristics, self-sacrificing self-enhancement was a significant predictor of both self- and parent-reported prosocial behavior in the current study. Exploitativeness also emerged as a predictor of self-reported prosocial behavior. The former also was associated with unique variance in self-reported prosocial behavior in a previous study (Kauten & Barry, 2014). Thus, it appears that the relation between pathological narcissism and prosocial behavior is driven by self-serving tendencies rather than a true desire to assist others.

It is noteworthy that self-reported prosocial behavior was unrelated to number of hours participants would ideally volunteer, or opportunity to volunteer when recognition would be bestowed on them, although it was positively associated with their report of



whether they would volunteer if they would not reap public recognition. These results suggest that one's self-report of prosocial behavior reflects some desire to engage in prosocial behavior independent of external validation. However, motives for such engagement are unclear in that a person could help others out of genuine concern for them, or for some personal gain outside of public recognition. In the model using self-sacrificing self-enhancement and intent to engage in prosocial behavior in both public and private realms to predict self-reported prosocial behavior, both self-sacrificing self-enhancement and intent to help in private each predicted unique variance. Thus, it seems as though self-reported prosocial tendencies capture both self-serving and more genuine motives to behave in a helpful manner.

Narcissistic individuals seem to be aware that their motivations and self-perceptions are discrepant from others' perceptions of them, such that they view themselves more favorably than do others (Carlson et al., 2011; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). The present study investigated whether a self-inflation of prosocial tendencies was related to narcissism as well as self-reports of emotional and social intelligence. Discrepancy analyses were completed for this purpose, and results indicated that inflation scores relative to both parents and peers were unrelated to both emotional and social intelligence. However, positive self-inflation relative to peers was significantly correlated with grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, suggesting that individuals who self-report elevated levels of these dimensions of narcissism perceive themselves to be significantly more prosocial than their peers perceive them.

Contrary to hypotheses, emotional intelligence did not moderate the relation between any variant of narcissism and any of the ratings of prosocial behavior. Social

intelligence moderated only the relation between grandiose narcissism and participant's report of ideal volunteer hours. Consistent with previous research (Petrides et al., 2006; Petrides et al., 2011), non-pathological narcissism was positively related to emotional intelligence. Further, pathological narcissism was negatively related to emotional intelligence. That non-pathological narcissism, in particular, was positively related to emotional intelligence, yet emotional intelligence did not exacerbate the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior of any informant, further emphasizes that such individuals may be particularly likely to use self- and other-knowing tendencies, not for the true benefit of others but rather, for their own agenda (Nagler, Reiter, Furtner, & Rauthmann, 2014). Thus, endorsement of prosocial behavior may be described, in part, as a strategic method used in pursuit of secondary gains, that is not augmented by understanding the emotions of others or social cues.

It is noteworthy that social intelligence moderated the relation between grandiose narcissism and ideal volunteer hours when the outlier on the open-ended question regarding ideal volunteer hours was excluded. Self-reported desire to engage in a relatively high number of volunteer hours was highest among individuals reporting elevated levels of grandiose narcissism and social intelligence. Such individuals may, in addition to having a motive to self-enhance through prosocial means, perceive themselves as uniquely capable of fulfilling others' needs based on their apparent knowledge and understanding of those needs. It is possible, however, that the form of the item (i.e., free response) contributed to high estimates of ideal volunteer hours without consideration of how reasonable their responses were. Rather than using social comprehension for others' benefits, the participants with elevated levels of grandiose narcissism could have

perceived that responding in an overly affirmative manner would have allowed them to stand out among their peers, thus fulfilling their need for superiority. Thus, reports of ideal volunteer hours for individuals who report grandiosity and have a capacity to understand social situations may reflect self-serving motives.

Although emotional and, largely, social intelligence did not moderate the relations between narcissism and prosocial behavior, some other unexplored construct may be relevant. Perhaps, emotional and social intelligence failed to explain the link between narcissism and self-reported prosocial behavior because these attributes include an understanding of others. That is, narcissistic individuals tend to be concerned primarily with advancing one's own social status and doing what is best for them. They may engage in prosocial behavior only when it would benefit them in such a way that is independent of knowledge of others' needs.

Emotional intelligence, by definition, relates to one's ability to express, read, and act upon emotions. In the present study, non-pathological narcissism demonstrated a positive relation with emotional intelligence, whereas vulnerable narcissism demonstrated an inverse relation. Non-pathological narcissism is characterized by elevated levels of self-esteem and feelings of superiority (Barry et al., 2003), and vulnerable narcissism is marked by a self-esteem that is heavily reliant on others and a devaluing of the self and others (Pincus et al., 2009). Thus, it is possible that their divergence in these realms explains their varying relations with emotional intelligence. In other words, emotional intelligence may require a sense of confidence in oneself that facilitates one's ability to accurately perceive others' needs. Individuals marked by vulnerable narcissism simply do not have that confidence; in addition, they likely do not

care for engaging with others enough to accurately attend to their emotions. With regard to the role of emotional intelligence in the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior, it is possible that individuals with high levels of narcissism simply do not use the skill of emotional intelligence to facilitate engagement in prosocial behavior.

The same motivation to help others, only if it would result in social gains, may be applied to the relation between narcissism and social intelligence. Individual variants of narcissism were only related to some elements of social intelligence. No form of narcissism was positively related to social awareness. Thus, even if individuals with elevated levels of narcissism wanted to help others, they may be simply confused about, or surprised by, what others need. Their general self-reported lack of social awareness could preclude them from understanding the positive or negative implications of their behaviors, and it underscores the self-absorption inherent in the narcissistic personality (Barry et al., 2003; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Pincus et al., 2009).

Nagler and colleagues (Nagler et al., 2014) found that narcissism is positively related to emotional expressivity and emotional control. They suggest that narcissism is unrelated to elements of social intelligence that are central to one's ability to accurately perceive and interpret one's emotions. The authors go on to explain that these abilities are not central to the narcissist's fundamental aim of maintaining a grandiose sense of self. That is, narcissists are able to maintain their distorted self-view without using the skills associated with emotional and social intelligence. Moreover, Nagler and colleagues found that narcissism moderated the relation between emotional control and emotional manipulation, such that higher levels of narcissism were related to a stronger relation between emotional control and emotional manipulation, suggesting that such

individuals use some elements of emotional intelligence for the purpose of interpersonal manipulation for personal gain. However, the results of the present study suggest that these purposes do not translate to a greater likelihood of prosocial behavior.

Interestingly, emotional intelligence accounted for significant variance in the prediction of both non-pathological and vulnerable narcissism when considered along with social intelligence. This model of using emotional and social intelligence to predict narcissism is similar to that reported by Delić and colleagues (2011) and produced similar results whereby emotional intelligence was a unique predictor for non-pathological narcissism. Perhaps, then, narcissistic individuals are capable of emotional intelligence, though only utilize its underlying abilities to the extent that it is beneficial to one's own desires (Nagler et al., 2014).

In many respects, the results of the present study underscore that various forms of narcissism function differently with regard to inter- and intrapersonal constructs. For example, although grandiose and vulnerable narcissism have shown significant interrelations across studies (c.f., Barry et al., 2014; Mechanic & Barry, 2015) as well as in the present study, they manifest differently with respect to emotional intelligence and social intelligence. Specifically, grandiose narcissism exhibited no relation with emotional or social intelligence, and vulnerable narcissism displayed a significant negative relation with those constructs. Their divergence was examined further in regard to dimensions of social intelligence. When entered into a simultaneous regression model, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism predicted unique variance for social skills in opposite directions. It may be that grandiose narcissism is tied to a primary focus on oneself and a positive appraisal regarding one's interpersonal skills. On the other hand,

the negative relation between vulnerable narcissism and social intelligence is consistent with its component parts which include self-esteem that is largely contingent on others' feedback as well as a sense of devaluing others, and angry responses if one's perceived entitlement is not honored. In other words, the component parts of vulnerable narcissism lend themselves to poor social awareness and interactions with others.

### Limitations

Despite its merits, the present study has some important limitations. First, participants were at-risk adolescents who were enrolled in a military-style residential program in the southeastern United States. Additionally, the majority of participants were Caucasian males. These demographic characteristics of the sample likely limit the generalizability of the results. It is uncertain whether the results would be replicated in another area of the country, within the general population, with samples consisting of a higher proportion of females, or with individuals of other ethnicities.

Additionally, several analyses were conducted. Eighteen regression analyses were conducted for each moderator, which could have increased the chance of Type I error. However, a Bonferroni correction was implemented to minimize the impact of family-wise error that resulted from these analyses. Given the lack of support for some hypotheses, a *post hoc* power analysis was conducted and revealed that, with a desired effect size of  $f^2 = 0.3$  based on previous research and accounting for the Bonferroni correction, power for self-report analyses was .99. Power for parent-report analyses was .95, and power for peer-reported analyses was .90. Based on these analyses, there seems to have been sufficient power to detect moderate effects as significant in each of the models predicting various perceptions of prosocial behavior.

The internal consistency of the Social Skills subscale of the Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale was exceptionally low, suggesting that those items may not have collectively adequately represented one's ability to interact easily with others. Still, results reflected previous research, suggesting that non-pathological narcissism is related to social skills and positive perceptions regarding interpersonal relationships (c.f., Barry & Wallace, 2010); thus, despite the low internal consistency of that subscale, it seems, as though, the items still capture some level of perceived interpersonal effectiveness.

Finally, although self- and parent-reported prosocial behavior were measured using the same instrument, peer nominations and self-report of behavioral intentions to volunteer were gathered using different means. Thus, it may be that these varied methods assessed different constructs. However, the association between intent to help without recognition and parent- and self-reported prosocial behaviors suggest that these various indices of prosocial behavior tapped at least a somewhat similar process.

#### Future Directions

Future research should continue to explore the mechanisms responsible for the relation between prosocial behavior and narcissism. Thus far, it appears that the self-serving elements of pathological narcissism are driving the relation between narcissism and reports of prosocial behavior. Perhaps some additional variable, such as approval seeking or manipulateness within interpersonal relationships, may account for the association between narcissism and self-reported prosocial behavior, and these possibilities should be explored further.

For example, Machiavellianism, which is characterized by a tendency toward manipulation and exploiting others, is closely related to the construct of narcissism (Lau

& Marsee, 2013). Individuals with Machiavellian tendencies “bistrategically use prosocial and antisocial tactics” to achieve their goals (Lau & Marsee, 2013, p. 356). It is possible, then, that individuals in the present study, who endorsed prosocial tendencies also use Machiavellian skills to obtain their goals, or that Machiavellianism may account for the relation between certain iterations of narcissism and prosocial behavior. Future research should consider this possibility.

Research may also seek to further examine the context-dependent nature of the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior. For example, it is apparent from the present study that individuals with narcissistic characteristics behave differently around parents versus peers, or at least that the different informants perceived such individuals’ behavior differently. Lannin and colleagues (Lannin, Gyll, Krizan, Madon, & Cornish, 2014) found that grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were associated with less helping under high and low social pressure, respectively. The present findings, combined with those of Lannin and colleagues (2014), put forth at least two contextual factors that may influence the expression of narcissistic behavior (i.e., interaction partner, social expectations). It may be valuable, then, to extend this research to explore additional contextual elements that influence the expression of prosocial behavior in narcissistic individuals such as age, setting (e.g., school versus home), or outcome expectancies tied to prosocial behavior.

It may also be useful to examine more idiosyncratic elements of the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior. For example, it could be informative to examine the process of moral reasoning for narcissistic individuals. Might they be capable of morally reasoning through various situations, or are they unable to identify



which behavior is appropriate to help others? Is engagement in moralistic behavior context-dependent for narcissistic individuals?

Determining factors that influence the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior can inform efforts to increase the likelihood that adolescents with these traits will engage in such desirable behaviors. That is, examining potential moderators and mediators may help to elucidate the relation between narcissism and prosocial behavior. Future research may, therefore, help inform efforts aimed at minimizing engagement in aggressive or antisocial behavior and increasing the likelihood of engagement in prosocial behavior for youth. By understanding the benefits of prosocial behavior in reaching personal social rewards and improving interpersonal relationships, narcissistic adolescents may use much more societally beneficial behavior as an alternative avenue to aggression in reaching social goals.

## APPENDIX A

## INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION



THE UNIVERSITY OF  
SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI

**INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001

Phone: 601.266.5997 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | [www.usm.edu/research/institutional.review.board](http://www.usm.edu/research/institutional.review.board)

**NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION**

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.  
Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 14090204

PROJECT TITLE: The Effectiveness of Motivational Interviewing with At-Risk Adolescents

PROJECT TYPE: New Project

RESEARCHER(S): Christopher Gillen, Christopher Barry, and Rebecca Kauten

COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Education and Psychology

DEPARTMENT: Psychology

FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: Aubrey K Lucas & Ella G Lucas Endowment for Faculty Excellence/DED1632

IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval

PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 09/09/2014 to 09/08/2015

**Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.**  
Institutional Review Board

## REFERENCES

- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema, 18*, 13-25.
- Barry, C. T., Frick, P. J., & Killian, A. L. (2003). The relation of narcissism and self-esteem to conduct problems in children: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 32*, 139-152.
- Barry, C. T., Grafeman, S. J., Adler, K. K., & Pickard, J. D. (2007). The relations among narcissism, self-esteem, and delinquency in a sample of at-risk adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 30*, 933-942.
- Barry, C. T., & Kauten, R. (2014). Nonpathological and pathological narcissism: Which self-reported characteristics are most problematic in adolescents? *Journal of Personality Assessment, 96*, 212-219.
- Barry, C. T., Kauten, R. & Lui, J. H. L. (2014). Self-perceptions of social support and empathy as potential moderators in the relation between adolescent narcissism and aggression. *Individual Differences Research, 12*, 170-179.
- Barry, C. T., Pickard, J. D., & Ansel, L. L. (2009). The associations of adolescent invulnerability and narcissism with problem behaviors in at-risk adolescents. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 577-582.
- Barry, C. T., & Wallace, M. T. (2010). Current considerations in the assessment of youth narcissism: Indicators of pathological and normative development. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 32*, 479-489.
- Bogart, L. M., Benotsch, E. G., & Pavlovic, J. D. (2004). Feeling superior but

- threatened: The relation of narcissism to social comparison. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 35-44.
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 219-229.
- Cadenhead, A. C., & Richman, C. L. (1996). The effects of interpersonal trust and group status on prosocial and aggressive behaviors. *Society for Personality Research*, 24, 169-184.
- Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others?: A story of narcissistic game-playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 340-354.
- Carlo, G., Hausmann, A., Christiansen, S., & Randall, B. A. (2003). Sociocognitive and behavioral correlates of a measure of prosocial tendencies for adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 23, 107-134.
- Carlo, G., & Randall, B.A. (2002). The development of a measure of prosocial behaviors for late adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 31, 31-44.
- Carlson, E. N., Naumann, L. P., & Vazire, S. (2011). Getting to know a narcissist inside and out. In W. K. Campbell & J. Miller (Eds.), *The Handbook of Narcissism and Narcissistic Personality Disorder* (285-299). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66, 710-720.
- Crowne, K. A. (2013). An empirical analysis of three intelligences. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 45, 105-114.

- Delič, L., Novak, P., Kovačič, J., & Avsec, A. (2011). Self-reported emotional and social intelligence and empathy as distinctive predictors of narcissism. *Psychological Topics, 3*, 477-488.
- Doğan, T. & Çetin, B. (2009). The validity, reliability and factorial structure of the Turkish version of the Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale. *Kuram ve Uygulamada Eğitim Bilimleri, 9*, 709-720.
- Donnellan, M. B., Conger, R. D., & Burzette, R. G. (2007). Personality development from late adolescence to young adulthood: Differential stability, normative maturity, and evidence for the maturity-stability hypothesis. *Journal of Personality, 75*, 237-264.
- Eberly Lewis, M. B. (2014). Parents as recipients of adolescent prosocial behavior. In L. Padilla-Walker & G. Carlo (Eds.), *Prosocial development: A multidimensional approach*. (305-326). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Emmons, R.A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 11-17.
- Farwell, L., & Wohlwend-Lloyd, R. (1998). Narcissistic processes: Optimistic expectations, favorable self-evaluations, and self-enhancing attributions. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 65-83.
- Ferrando, M., Prieto, M. D., Almeida, L. S., Ferrandiz, C., Bermejo, R., Lopez-Pina, J. A.... Fernandez, M. (2011). Trait emotional intelligence and academic performance: Controlling for the effects of IQ, personality, and self-concept. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment, 29*, 150-159.
- Fossati, A., Borroni, S., Eisenberg, N., & Maffei, C. (2010). Relations of proactive and

reactive dimensions of aggression to overt and covert narcissism in nonclinical adolescents. *Aggressive Behavior*, 36, 21-27.

Frederickson, N., Petrides, K. V., & Simmonds, E. (2012). Trait emotional intelligence as a predictor of socioemotional outcomes in early adolescence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 323-328.

Golmaryami, F. N., & Barry, C. T. (2010). The associations of self-reported and peer-Reported relational aggression with narcissism and self-esteem among adolescents in a residential setting. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 39, 128-133.

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York: Guilford.

Hill, P. L., & Lapsley, D. K. (2011). Adaptive and maladaptive narcissism in adolescent development. In C.T. Barry, P. K. Kerig, K. K. Stellwagen, & T. D. Barry (Eds.), *Narcissism and Machiavellianism in youth: Implications for the development of adaptive and maladaptive behavior* (pp. 89-105). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Kauten, R. (2013). Adolescent narcissism and prosocial behavior as a function of peer, parent, and self perception. (Unpublished masters thesis). The University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg.

Kauten, R. & Barry, C. T., (2014). Do you think I'm as kind as I do? The relation of adolescent narcissism with self- and peer- perceptions of prosocial and aggressive behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 61, 69-73.

Kiefer, S. M. & Ryan, A. M. (2008). Striving for social dominance over peers: The

- implications for academic adjustment during early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100, 417-428.
- Kinga, S., & Ibolya, K. (2013). The predictive value of social intelligence for cooperative behavior in a task-oriented interaction paradigm: A pilot study. *Erdélyi Pszichológiai Szemle*, 14, 255-274.
- Kimonis, E.R., Frick, P.J., Muñoz, L.C., & Aucoin, K.J. (2007). Can a laboratory measure of emotional processing enhance the statistical prediction of aggression and delinquency in detained adolescents with callous-unemotional traits? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 35, 773-785.
- Küfner, A. C. P, Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2013). The two pathways to being an (un-)popular narcissist. *Journal of Personality*, 81, 184-195.
- Kumru, A. & Lağmurlu, B. (2014). Prosocial behaviors toward siblings and grandparents. In L. Padilla-Walker & G. Carlo (Eds.) *Prosocial development: A multidimensional approach*. (pp. 327-349). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Lau, K. S. L. & Marsee, M. A. (2013). Exploring narcissism, psychopathy, and Machiavellianism in youth: Examination of associations with antisocial behavior and aggression. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 22, 355-367.
- Lannin, D. G., Gyll, M., Krizan, Z., Madon, S., & Cornish, M. (2014). When are grandiose and vulnerable narcissists least helpful? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 127-132.

- Li, A. & Bagger, J. (2007). The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR): A reliability generalization study. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 67, 525-544.
- Maxwell, K., Donnellan, M. B., Hopwood, C. J., & Ackerman, R. A. (2011). The two faces of Narcissus? An empirical comparison of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50, 577-582.
- Mechanic, K. L. & Barry, C. T. (2015). Adolescent grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: Associations with perceived parenting practices. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24, 1510-1518.
- Meijs, N., Cillessen, A. H., Scholte, R. H., Segers, E., & Spijkerman, R. (2010). Social intelligence and academic achievement as predictors of adolescent popularity. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39, 62-72.
- Morf, C. C. & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unravelling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 177-196.
- Nagler, U. K. J., Reiter, K. J., Furtner, M. R., & Rauthmann, J. F. (2014). Is there a “dark intelligence”? Emotional intelligence is used by dark personalities to emotionally manipulate others. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 65, 47-52.
- Ojanen, T., Findley, D., & Fuller, S. (2012). Physical and relational aggression in early adolescence: Associations with narcissism, temperament, and social goals. *Aggressive Behavior*, 38, 99-107.
- Ojanen, T., Grönroos, M., & Salmivalli, C. (2005). Applying the interpersonal circumplex model to children's social goals: Connections with peer reported behavior and



- sociometric status. *Developmental Psychology*, 41, 699-710.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1988). *Assessing self deception and impression management in self-reports: The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding*. Unpublished manual, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada.
- Paunonen, S. V., & LeBel, E. P. (2012). Socially desirable responding and its elusive effects of the validity of personality assessments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103, 158-175.
- Petrides, K. V., Sangareau, Y., Furnham, A., & Frederickson, N. (2006). Trait emotional intelligence and children's peer relations at school. *Social Development*, 15, 537-547.
- Petrides, K. V., Vernon, P. A., Schermer, J. A., & Veselka, L. (2011). Trait emotional intelligence and the dark triad traits of personality. *Twin Research and Human Genetics*, 14, 35-41.
- Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 21, 365-379.
- Pincus, A. L., & Lukowitsky, M. R. (2010). Pathological narcissism and Narcissistic Personality Disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 6, 421-446.
- Pincus, A. L., & Roche, M. J. (2011). Narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability. . In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The Handbook of Narcissism and Narcissistic Personality Disorder* (pp. 31-40). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Poulou, M. S. (2010). The role of Trait Emotional Intelligence and social and emotional

- skills in students' emotional and behavioural strengths and difficulties: A study of Greek adolescents' perceptions. *The International Journal of Emotional Education*, 2, 30-47.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 45, 590.
- Reidy, D.E., Foster, J.D., & Zeichner, A. (2010). Narcissism and unprovoked aggression: Is there more than just an ego threat? *Aggressive Behavior*, 36, 414-422.
- Rieck, T., & Callahan, J. L. (2013). Emotional intelligence and psychotherapy outcomes in a training clinic. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology*, 7, 42-52.
- Roche, M. J., Pincus, A. L., Lukowitsky, M. R., Menard, K. S., & Conroy, D. E. (2013). An integrative approach to the assessment of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 95, 237-248.
- Saroglou, V., Pichon, I., Trompette, L., Verschueren, M., & Dernelle, R. (2005). Prosocial behavior and religion: New evidence based on projective measures and peer ratings. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 44, 323-348.
- Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 42, 313-319.
- Thomaes, S., Stegge, H., Olthof, T., Bushman, B. J., & Nezlek, J. B. (2011). Turning shame inside-out: "Humiliated fury" in young adolescents. *Emotion*, 11, 786-793.
- Thomas, K. M., Wright, A. G. C., Lukowitsky, M. R., Donnellan, M. B., & Hopwood, C. J. (2012). Evidence for the criterion validity and clinical utility of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Assessment*, 19, 135-145.

- Thorndike, R. L., & Stein, S. (1937). An evaluation of the attempts to measure social intelligence. *Psychological Bulletin*, 34, 275–285.
- Twenge, J. M., Baumeister, R. F., DeWall, C. N., Ciarocco, N. J., & Bartels, J. M. (2007). Social exclusion decreases prosocial behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 56-66.
- Van Rooy, D. L., Viswesvaran, C., & Pluta, P. (2005). A meta-analytic evaluation of construct validity: What is this thing called emotional intelligence? *Human Performance*, 18, 445-462.
- Vonk, J., Zeigler-Hill, V., Mayhew, P., & Mercer, S. (2013). Mirror, mirror on the wall, which form of narcissist knows self and others best of all? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 54, 396-401.
- Wentzel, K. R. (2014). Prosocial behavior and peer relations in adolescence. In L. Padilla-Walker & G. Carlo (Eds.) *Prosocial development: A multidimensional approach*. (pp. 178-200). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, K. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 425-452.